

Remarks

Claims 1-17 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 2 and 14 are amended, and claims 18 and 19 are added. Claims 2 and 14 are amended for form. Support for new claim 18 can be found in the specification at, for example, page 9, line 23 to page 10, line 6. Support for new claim 19 can be found in the specification, for example, at page 10, line 31 to page 11, line 5. No new matter is added.

Claims 1, 16 and 17 are objected to for reciting the word "has" instead of "having." The objections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that the current recitation in claims 1, 16 and 17 satisfies all formal requirements. By the August 10, 2007 Amendment, Applicants amended claims 1, 16 and 17 to recite "the side part being in parallel with the sheet feed direction and having a front edge and a rear edge" (emphasis added). Therefore, claims 1, 16 and 17 are grammatically correct and satisfy all formal requirements. Applicants thus respectfully request withdrawal of the objection.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Specifically, the Office Action asserts that the term "perforated line" lacks antecedent basis. Applicants have amended claim 14 accordingly. Applicants thus respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 1 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Fujiwara (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0164317). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Fujiwara does not teach or suggest every feature of independent claims 1 and 16. Fujiwara does not teach or suggest (1) "the side part being in parallel with the sheet feed direction;" or (2) "the side part is structured such that the front edge contacts with a projecting

part formed in the sheet storage unit;" as recited in independent claim 1, and as similarly recited in independent claim 16 (emphasis added).

The Office Action asserts that the diagonally cut lines of the extending part 4 correspond to the side part of independent claims 1 and 16 (see Office Action, page 2). However, the alleged "side part" extends diagonally and not in the feed sheet direction 15 (see Fig. 3 of Fujiwara). Therefore, Fujiwara does not teach or suggest the side part being in parallel with the sheet feed direction, as recited in independent claims 1 and 16.

Also, the alleged "side part" of Fujiwara does not contain a front edge that contacts a projecting part of the sheet storage unit, as recited in independent claims 1 and 16. Again, the Office Action asserts that the diagonally cut edges of the projecting part 4 of Fujiwara correspond to the side part of claims 1 and 16. However, the alleged "side part" of Fujiwara contains only one edge, and this edge does not contact a projecting part of the sheet storage unit (see Fig. 4 of Fujiwara). Fig. 4 of Fujiwara shows the sheets moving over the projecting portion 4 with no contact between the diagonally cut edges of the projecting portion 4 and any projecting part of a sheet storage unit. Therefore, Fujiwara does not teach or suggest the front edge of the side part contacting with a projecting part formed in the sheet storage unit, as recited in independent claims 1 and 16.

Thus, for at least these reasons, claims 1 and 16 are patentable over Fujiwara. Applicants thus respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 1-5, 9, and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Moser (U.S. Patent No. 4,494,746) in view of Fujiwara. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Moser and Fujiwara, alone or in a permissible combination, do not teach or suggest every feature of independent claims 1 and 16. Moser does not remedy the deficiencies of Fujiwara. The Office Action admits on page 3 that Moser does not teach the side part at a

first and second position. Thus, Moser does not teach or suggest (1) "the side part being in parallel with the sheet feed direction;" or (2) "the side part is structured such that the front edge contacts with a projecting part formed in the sheet storage unit;" as recited in independent claim 1 and as similarly recited in independent claim 16. In addition, Fujiwara does not disclose this feature for at least the reasons discussed above with regard to the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection over Fujiwara.

Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 16 are patentable over the alleged combination of Moser and Fujiwara. Claims 2-5, 9 and 15, which variously depend from independent claim 1, are also patentable for at least their dependency on independent claim 1, as well as for the additional features they recite. Applicants thus respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 1-4, 9 and 13-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Sasaki et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0056961) in view of Fujiwara. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Sasaki and Fujiwara, alone or in a permissible combination, do not teach or suggest every feature of independent claims 1, 16 and 17. The Office Action admits on page 4 that Sasaki does not teach the side part at a first and second position. Thus, the alleged combination of Sasaki and Fujiwara does not teach or suggest (1) "the side part being in parallel with the sheet feed direction;" or (2) "the side part is structured such that the front edge contacts with a projecting part formed in the sheet storage unit;" as recited in independent claim 1 and as similarly recited in independent claim 16. In addition, Fujiwara does not disclose this feature for at least the reasons discussed above with regard to the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection over Fujiwara.

Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 16 and 17 are patentable over the alleged combination of Sasaki and

Fujiwara. Claims 2-4, 9 and 13-15, which variously depend from independent claim 1, are also patentable for at least their dependency on independent claim 1, as well as for the additional features they recite. Applicants thus respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Moser in view of Fujiwara and further in view of Ishiduka et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,217,019); claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Sasaki in view of Fujiwara and in further view of Ishiduka; claims 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Moser in view of Fujiwara and in further view of Ishiduka; and claims 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Sasaki in view of Fujiwara and in further view of Ishiduka. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Ishiduka does not remedy the above-described deficiencies of Fujiwara, Sasaki and Moser. Ishiduka is merely cited by the Office Action for its alleged disclosure of "a sensor provided to the sheet storage unit, [and] a difference between a length of the side part in the sheet feed direction after the removal of one of the two parts at the perforated line and a distance from the pressing member to a rear wall of the sheet storage unit in the sheet feed direction is smaller than a maximum permissible displacement of the mark for the sensor wherein the mark indicates the type of the stack of sheets," at page 7 of the Office Action. Further, Ishiduka does not teach or suggest (1) "the side part being in parallel with the sheet feed direction;" or (2) "the side part is structured such that the front edge contacts with a projecting part formed in the sheet storage unit;" as recited in independent claim 1, from which claims 6-8 and 10-12 depend.

Thus, claims 6-8 and 10-12 are patentable for at least their dependency on independent claim 1, as well as for the additional features they recite. Applicants thus respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

In addition, none of the applied references teach or suggest the features of dependent claims 18 and 19. For example, Fujiwara does not teach or suggest "a first part and a second part that are structured to be detachable, the first part and the second part being on opposing sides of the package member and each part being in parallel with the sheet feed direction," as recited in dependent claim 18.

As disclosed at paragraph [0034] of Fujiwara, "the belt-like member that is the boundary between these parts ..." is connected to both the cover part 2 and the lengthened part 4 (emphasis added) (see also Figs 1-3 of Fujiwara). In other words, the cover part and the belt like member are connected to one another before detachment. Therefore, Fujiwara does not teach or suggest "the first part and the second part being on opposing sides of the package member and each part being in parallel with the sheet feed direction," as recited in dependent claim 18.

Finally, Fujiwara does not teach or suggest "the front edge of the side part contains a perforated portion and a cut portion, the perforated portion including cut parts and uncut parts arranged alternately, the cut portion including only cut parts," as recited in dependent claim 19 (emphasis added).

Again, the entire alleged "side part" of Fujiwara is perforated, and contains burrs when cut based on these perforations (see paragraph [0012] of Fujiwara). Fujiwara does not disclose perforated cut portions and completely cut portions. Therefore, after removal along the alleged "side part" of Fujiwara, there is no surface that is completely uncut that may come into contact with a sheet storage unit. Therefore, Fujiwara does not teach or suggest "the front edge of the side part contains a perforated portion and a cut portion," as recited in dependent claim 19 (emphasis added).

Moreover, Ishiduka, Sasaki and Moser do not remedy Ishiduka's deficiencies for at least the reasons discussed above. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 18 and 19 are also patentable over the applied references.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Patrick T. Muffo
Registration No. 60,342

JAO/PTM/tbm

Attachment:
Request for Continued Examination

Date: January 2, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

| |
|---|
| <p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p> |
|---|